



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/875,547	06/05/2001	Dan Kikinis	007287.00008	6896
22907 7590 10/23/2009 BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD. 1100 13th STREET, N.W. SUITE 1200 WASHINGTON, DC 20005-4051			EXAMINER SALTARELLI, DOMINIC D	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2421	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			10/23/2009 PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/875,547

Applicant(s)

KIKINIS, DAN

Examiner

DOMINIC D. SALTARELLI

Art Unit

2421

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 August 2009.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,4-8,11-15,18-24 and 29 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,4-8,11-15,18-24 and 29 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/C)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on August 14, 2009 has been entered.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments filed August 14, 2009 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

First, applicant argues that Hassell does not teach the amended limitations of automatically transferring a program in response to the selection of the program from the program guide listing, teaching instead providing the option of transferal from a list of options provided after the selection of a 'super-program' (applicant's remarks, page 6).

In response, the provision of an option to transfer from amongst a list of options is disclosed by Hassell as an alternative to a dedicated transfer key on the remote control (Hassell, paragraph 0081 "If user interface 46 is a remote control such as remote control 40 in FIG. 2, the user may use a "record" or

"transfer" key when in the super-program screen, **or, for example**, the user may select a transfer option from an on-screen list of options..." [emphasis added]).

Second, applicant argues that Hassell does not explicitly disclose automatically defaulting to the first storage device if the second storage device is unavailable, and therefore cannot be said to anticipate the claim limitations directed to such (applicant's remarks, page 7).

In response, first Hassell discloses that the secondary storage devices are both external using removable media and optional (paragraph 0019). Hassell next discloses that users can *also* record programs on digital storage device 31 (paragraph 0020) which can be located inside the set top device (paragraph 0021). Further, Hassell teaches that upon receiving a 'record' command, the first step taken is to automatically check the storage capabilities of the currently loaded digital storage medium (removable storage is checked first, paragraph 0043). A defining characteristic of the secondary storage devices is that the media is removable by a user (such as removable DVDs or magnetic discs), thus it is within the scope of the disclosure that there will be situations where there is no removable media inserted (paragraph 0047). Further, when a record command is received, after scanning the recording capabilities of the available storage space, the system then automatically locates available space on which to store the selection (paragraph 0051). Therefore, it is the examiner's understanding that implementing Hassell's invention in practice is analogous to applicant's invention, lacking only the fact that the remote control is also a 'web

phone', since Hassell teaches having access to both an internal storage and removable storage, but clearly giving preference to the removable storage when receiving a record command. Thus while there is no explicit teaching stating that Hassell defaults to the first storage device if the second storage device is unavailable, it is the examiner's understanding of Hassell that this is how the device operates when actually implemented.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1, 4-8, 11-15, and 18-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hassell et al. (US 2004/0128685 A1, of record) [Hassell] in view of Shintani (5,668,591, of record) and Lee et al. (5,937,163, of record) [Lee].

Regarding claims 1, 8, and 15, Hassell discloses a method (and corresponding system) comprising:

displaying an electronic programming guide comprising a listing of one or more programs (figs. 5a-b);

receiving, at a set top box (STB), input corresponding to an actuation of a command selecting a program from the listing of one or more programs in the electronic program guide and transferring a program from a first storage device

of the STB to a second storage device (see the last sentence of paragraph 9) in response to the actuation (paragraphs 19-21, and 81, wherein actuation of the "transfer" key causes the system to transfer a selected program to another volume, where the first and second storage devices [volumes] consist of removable discs, see paragraph 89), wherein the program from the first storage device of the STB was stored on the first storage device because the second storage device was unavailable at the time the program was stored (Hassell teaches the storage devices are external or internal to the STB and removable, and thus the situation would arise where second storage device would be unavailable, thus automatically defaulting to the first storage device, see paragraphs 0019-0021).

.Hassell fails to disclose the actuation includes a single pressing of a selected portion of a web phone.

In an analogous art, Shintani teaches using a personal digital assistant to transmit commands to a set top box (cable box 1), where using such a type of intelligent remote control unit also allows a user to engage in more interactive functions (col. 3, lines 16-36).

It would have been obvious at the time to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method, computer readable medium, and system disclosed by Hassell to use a personal digital assistant as the associated remote control [would thus include the disclosed "transfer" key as found on the remote control disclosed by Hassell], as taught by Shintani, providing the benefit of allowing a

user to engage in more interactive functions, like games, home shopping, banking, and the like.

Hassell and Shintani fail to disclose the personal digital assistant is a web phone.

In an analogous art, Lee teaches it was known at the time to enable personal digital assistants with 'web phone' capabilities (accessing the World Wide Web over a cellular network, see col. 4, lines 6-34, the 'Webman' product).

It would have been obvious at the time to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method, computer readable medium, and system disclosed by Hassell and Shintani to enable the personal digital assistant as a web phone, as taught by Lee, simply utilizing a brand of PDA which was both known and commercially available at the time.

Regarding claims 4, 11, and 18, Hassell, Shintani, and Lee disclose the method, machine readable medium, and system of claims 1, 8, and 15, wherein in response to a second input corresponding to a second actuation of a second command, transferring the program from the second storage device to the first storage device of the STB, wherein the second actuation corresponds to a pressing of a second portion of the personal digital assistant (a user is provided with the means to transfer programs between volumes at will using the "transfer" key, see paragraphs 9 and 81).

Regarding claims 5, 12, and 19, Hassell, Shintani, and Lee disclose the method, machine readable medium, and system of claims 4, 11, and 18, and further discloses maintaining an index of programs and related auxiliary data transferred from the first storage device to the second storage device (paragraphs 85-86).

Regarding claims 6, 13, and 20, Hassell, Shintani, and Lee disclose the method, machine readable medium, and system of claims 5, 12, and 19, wherein the second storage device is a removable storage device (Hassell, paragraph 85), and in response to a user selecting the program, the STB prompts for the insertion of the removable storage device into the STB (Hassell, paragraph 89).

Regarding claims 7, 14, and 21, Hassell, Shintani, and Lee disclose the method, machine readable medium, and system of claims 6, 14, and 20, wherein the removable storage device is a DVD-RAM (paragraph 20).

Regarding claim 22, Hassell, Shintani, and Lee disclose the method of claim 4, wherein the second actuation corresponds to a single pressing of a transfer function button on the remote control (the personal digital assistant is the remote control, see Shintani, col. 3, lines 16-36).

Regarding claim 23, Hassell, Shintani, and Lee disclose the method of claim 4, wherein the first portion and the second portion are the same portion (the 'transfer' key is the common portion used in transferring programs from one location to another, see Hassell, paragraph 81).

Regarding claim 24, Hassell, Shintani, and Lee disclose the system of claim 15, wherein Hassell discloses the STB to include a tuner (to perform the channel tuning operation, paragraph 19); a signal input (fig. 2, input 26); a storage medium (fig. 2, digital storage device 31); a processor (an inherent feature of the disclosed STB, which is necessary to control the operations ascribed to the STB); a digital video encoder and decoder (the encoder for converting the program to a desired format, see paragraph 82, where the destination for storage is a digital medium, see paragraph 85, and the decoder for outputting program content to a television, see paragraph 22); and a digital output port (for outputting digital signals on a digital bus, see paragraph 19).

Regarding claim 29, Hassell, Shintani, and Lee disclose the method of claim 1, further comprising:

receiving a command to record the selected program prior to received the selection of the program (the program is first selected by the user for recording, is then recorded, before it is subsequently selected for transferal to a different volume, Hassell, paragraph 0042);

determining whether the second storage device is available; and
in response to determining that the second storage device is unavailable, automatically recording the program to the first storage device (Hassell teaches the storage devices are external or internal to the STB and removable, and thus the situation would arise where second storage device would be unavailable, thus automatically defaulting to the first storage device, see paragraphs 0019-0021).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to DOMINIC D. SALTARELLI whose telephone number is (571)272-7302. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 9:00am - 6:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Miller can be reached on (571) 272-7353. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2421

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Dominic D Saltarelli/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2421